DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 463 SP 013 036

AUTHOR Gillan, Robert E.
TITLE Teacher Preparation and Certification for the Middle School Grades.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Cognitive Processes; Learning Processes; *Middle Schools; *Staff Improvement; *State Standards; Student Characteristics; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The issue of specialized teacher education and certification for the middle school grades is discussed. The general background on teacher preparation for the middle school grades is covered, and findings of studies concerning teacher education and certification for the middle school are presented. The history of the growth of the middle school is traced with the special needs of students and characteristics desirable in their teachers emphasized. The results of a state-by-state survey of middle school certification requirements are presented in tabular form. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dr. Robert E. Gillan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED178463

TEACHER PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION FOR THE MIDDLE SCHOOL GRADES

The purpose of this paper is to present a review of the literature concerning teacher certification for the middle school grades. The paper is divided into six major sections: (1) General background on teacher preparation for the middle school grades, (2) Findings of studies concerning teacher preparation and certification for the middle school grades, (3) Growth of the middle school, (4) Need for special certification for the middle school, (5) Current status of middle school certification, and (6) Summary.

GENERAL BACKGROUND ON TEACHER PREPARATION FOR THE MIDDLE SCHOOL GRADES

In historical perspective, the "school in the middle" has been one of the most neglected areas of American education. At the outset, the junior high was staffed by teachers who were prepared by both training and interest to teach at another level. (20:550) The negative effects of this staffing practice were further compounded by a salary differential which paid the junior high teacher less because he "didn't need to know as much as the high school teacher." (8:268) Paying the junior high school teachers at a rate below that of high school teachers had the effect of filling

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP013036

the junior high schools with former high school teachers who had been demoted, former elementary teachers who moved up for the financial benefits, or inexperienced young teachers who were waiting for their promotion to the senior high school. (22:554)

Even after the salary differentials were eliminated, recruitment of good junior high teachers was extremely difficult. The major difficulty in this recruitment was the lack of interest of prospective teachers in teaching in the junior high school. This lack of interest is partially attributable to a lack of prestige for the junior high school teacher as opposed to high school teaching; partially to a desire to work with younger children on an elementary level; partially to a wish to teach subject matter in depth to high school students; partially to a lack of understanding of the early adolescent and of the background, history, philosophy, functions, and goals of the junior high school; and partially to a dislike verging on fear for the entire age group and junior high concept. (8:268)

Closely related to the problems of teacher preparation are state certification requirements. A fundamental purpose of certification is to protect the children and the state against incompetent or inadequately trained teachers. Certification requirements establish minimum standard qualifications for a certain division of the school system and/or subject for which special preparation has been made to help eliminate the practice of hiring a teacher for

special reasons and then assigning the teacher to a grade or subject vacancy for which the teacher is completely unprepared. (10:428)

To date, no unitary pattern of certification for the staff assigned to an intermediate school exists. Even in the case of the junior high school, after over fifty years of operation, a majority of the states have no special certification requirements for the junior high school teacher. In most cases teachers are certified for either elementary or secondary education, with all teachers supposedly qualified to teach in the middle. On the contrary, however, middle school teaching is probably the most difficult area for teachers, and to imply that either an elementary or secondary teacher is automatically qualified to teach at this level is short-sighted, to say the least. (17:61)

Hoats found that forty-six states accepted the secondary certificate for grades seven through nine while twenty-one accepted the elementary certificate. Even in those few states where a junior high school teaching certificate is issued, the majority will accept an elementary or secondary certificate for the teacher. (21:47)

In addition to the study by Hoats, one completed by Wilson showed that of the forty-two states included in the study, the majority required junior high school teachers to have a secondary certificate with some type of modification,

endorsement, or requirement. Only one state reported a so-called junior high school pattern. (29:100)

In practice, the prevailing philosophy appears to be that certification standards and regulations are of little value when so few teachers meet the requirements. Neither the secondary nor the elementary certificate is appropriate in itself for any form of intermediate school. None of the teacher training programs for these certificates provides the necessary background for meeting the needs of children in the intermediate unit. (10:429)

Bossing expressed the need for specific training for the various levels as follows:

> The present deficiencies in most college and university programs offering training for junior high school teaching will be overcome by universal teacher preparation programs which fail to recognize the distinctive nature of learning at the elementary school level, the junior high school level, and the senior high school level. This in no way negates the commonalities inherent in all learning; in analogy, we might think of a family consisting of three individuals residing in the same house but requiring unique resources to meet their individual needs. When resources are non-existent or do not fill one member's needs, a state of disequilibrium is established within the family unit which reduces the strength and effectiveness of all members. This concept is strikingly applicable to the "family" of the three different and separately functioning school units. (15:152-153)

If the term "intermediate school level" is substituted for "junior high school level" in the above, the ideas may be applied to what has been said about the need for specific training for the specific level and the responsibility of state departments of education and teacher training

institutions to work cooperatively in producing qualified teachers. (10:430)

The teaching staff of the junior high school has unusual responsibilities in working with children who are leaving childhood and emerging into adolescence, for them a new and complex situation. Thus a need obviously exists, in an institution with special purposes and functions, for an unusually well-qualified and specially trained staff. (8:269) Bossing emphasized that:

> . . . we are reaching a point at which we are ready to say a teacher not specifically prepared and qualified would now appear as unfitted to teach in the junior high school as would a well-qualified teacher for the senior high school be unfitted to teach in the elementary school. (15:151)

If the junior high school student is indeed a unique individual in a school environment that is neither elementary nor secondary, then the teachers for the junior high school must be prepared in programs that are distinct and different from those of elementary teachers and secondary teachers. As one educator stated somewhat wryly, "Who should teach in the junior high school? The answer is obvious: junior high school teachers!" (25:75)

In recent years the growing interest in the middle school movement has again focused attention on teacher preparation for the intermediate grades. As Clarke pointed out, one of the major failings of the junior high school was the lack of properly trained teachers, and now the same mistake is about to be repeated with the current middle school

programs. Teachers were not properly prepared for the junior high school, and now the same programs are expected to supply personal capable of meeting the special needs of the middle school student. (16:218)

Until recently, most teacher training for the middle school has been in the form of retraining elementary or secondary teachers through inservice training. But the rapid growth of middle schools necessitates a training program at the preservice level. Present teacher education programs preparing elementary or secondary teachers no longer are adequate for training middle school teachers. The new middle school requires a teacher that is neither elementary nor secondary. (2:1)

The undergraduate preparation of middle school teachers should reflect what is known about the developmental stage known as transescence. The construction of a curriculum for middle school teaching must be based upon how learning takes place, how middle schools can facilitate the learning process, and how middle school teachers can create an environment for learning. A curriculum constructed around these purposes will have an individuality that sets it clearly apart from both the elementary and secondary school teacher preparation curriculum. (16:218-219)

Bondi concluded that a new kind of teacher is needed for the new middle school. The people involved in teacher training at all levels must devote their energies in the

years ahead to the task of identifying those persons who possess the characteristics of a good middle school teacher:

1. First and foremost, a middle school teacher must like the age group he is working with--the ten to fourteen-year-olds.

2. A second characteristic of the new kind of middle school teacher is his ability to work with other teachers.

3. A third characteristic of the "new teacher" is his ability to properly diagnose individual needs and to make proper prescriptions. (2:1-3)

If a middle school teacher possesses these characteristics, he will do his part in humanizing the school and help to make the middle school something special, something significant, something stimulating in American education. (2:1-7)

FINDINGS OF STUDIES CONCERNING TEACHER PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION FOR THE MIDDLE SCHOOL GRADES

Over the past decade more than a dozen fairly sophisticated studies have been conducted on the question of how teachers should be prepared for the intermediate grades. These studies, most in the form of doctoral dissertations, indicated considerable agreement across the country as to what ingredients should make up the teacher training program, but not as to the quantity of each ingredient. (6:56)

In a 1960 study by Ackerman, thirty-six National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) approved institution programs for the preparation of junior

high school teachers were analyzed. Ackerman conducted this analysis by using a list of component parts for teacher education programs across the country. Most of the special programs were found by Ackerman to be simply modifications of the curricula for either elementary or secondary teachers. The conclusions of the study indicated that neither the elementary or secondary program of teacher training, with or without minor adjustment, effectively prepared teachers for the intermediate grades. The educators surveyed were unanimous in their demand for a thorough knowledge of the junior high school child on the part of the prospective teacher. (30:96-97)

In a study which provided background for the certification requirements for junior high school teachers in the state of Oregon, Conway summarized the issue in the following manner:

> The question of the best type of preparation for junior high school teachers has been one that has received an ever increasing amount of attention in the literature of the past few years. Probably in no other single aspect concerning the school has there been such a lack of agreement. The only consensus appears to be of dissatisfaction with existing practices. . . . (31:51)

The work of Van Til at George Peabody College for Teachers has produced several significant studies of the junior high school, as well as, an excellent text on the subject. (13:6) One of the most interesting of these studies conducted by Dalton, analyzed the differences in professional preparation programs for the intermediate grade teacher. (32:3)

The teachers in each of Dalton's samples were compared with respect to: (1) general scholastic achievement, (2) liberal arts education, (3) professional education, (4) levels and extent of teaching experiences, (5) teaching assignments, (6) degrees and certification, and (7) experiences with children and youth other than in school situations. An analysis of the comparison of pre-service preparation program of two groups which differ significantly in effectiveness as teachers indicated that those in the high group had better undergraduate academic records and more hours in methods, guidance, and psychology courses. Other than in these areas, the pre-service preparation program of the two groups had no significant differences. (32:106-108)

Dean conducted a study similar to the work of Van Til and Dalton at Michigan State University. His study analyzed the differences in the reactions to pre-service programs expressed by teachers at the time teaching at the upper elementary level, the high school level, and the intermediate level. The study yielded significant differences in the areas of specialized subject matter, guidance and counseling, special education, reading methods, and core curriculum. The teachers who had actual teaching experiences in the junior high school indicated that these areas needed consideration in a specific curriculum for prospective junior high school teachers. The teachers further indicated that the specific curriculum needed to be

permeated with the child-centered approach commonly associated with elementary teacher programs. (33:66-67)

Marsh's study of teacher education for the junior high school teachers completed in 1960 (39:49) concluded that the teachers in their own opinion have not been adequately prepared to teach children at the separately organized school.

In a 1960 study by Maynard (40:79) of preparation for junior high school teachers, he found general agreement, as with the educators mentioned above, as to the courses that were basic to the junior high school teacher training program.

A 1968 study of teacher attitudes authored by Hubert included the following conclusions and recommendations:

> Secondary education students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels overwhelmingly preferred to work with older students and higher grade levels. This study also demonstrated that greater familiarity with the junior high or middle school tended to improve the respondent's attitude toward teaching at that level. Those who had done student teaching at the junior high or middle school level were generally more positive than those whose experiences were limited to high school. One or more courses on the history, purposes, and philosophy of the junior high or middle school also had a very positive effect on attitudes toward the middle grades. (22:551)

According to Hubert, those teachers who had experience at the junior high or middle school level were most critical of their own preparation and most skeptical of identical preparation for those who would teach at the junior high or middle school level. (22:551)

In a 1969 survey of 1915 teachers to determine their evaluation of existing teacher preparation for the middle grades, Sheehan concluded the following:

> Few of these teachers had anticipated, during training, that they might subsequently teach in a junior high school.
>
> A very small proportion had had practice teaching assignments at this level. Pre-service preparation as it relates to a teaching experience at the junior high school level was rated unsatisfactory. The group expressed the opinion that teaching at this level required special training not normally provided in the traditional elementary or secondary program.
>
> Student teaching, English composition and literature, and three psychology courses were rated as the most valuable of those courses taken during undergraduate training. (41:112-113)

A 1972 follow-up on the 1969 study conducted by Hubert gathered both factual and attitudinal data from teachers at the junior middle school level. The factual data dealt with the teachers' educational backgrounds and career plans. The attitudinal data were concerned with the teachers' attitudes toward the professional preparation which they had received prior to their teaching assignments and graduate course experience as well as their recommendations for undergraduate preparation. (22:551)

The most notable results of this 1972 study by Hubert centered on the teachers' recommendations regarding program improvements. The responding teachers expressed clear-cut and uncompromising preferences in their recommendations for a specific undergraduate preparation for the middle grade teacher. In the area of course work, the teachers showed strong support for courses described thusly:

adolescent and pre-adolescent psychology, and subject matter methods and materials for the junior high or middle school. (22:553)

The teachers also showed definite preference in the area of programs and experiences for the undergraduate preparation of middle grade teachers, to include required student teaching at this level. Among other suggestions the teachers made were the necessity of instruction in the teaching of reading and classroom management techniques. (22:553)

The teachers reinforced earlier findings by rating their own teacher preparation at the undergraduate level as satisfactory in 3 percent of the cases and graduate preparation even lower at 2 percent. This serious shortcoming, as indicated by the above ratings, was in the opinion of the teachers a result of inadequate communication between the teacher training program and the teachers in the middle grades. (22:554)

Hubert concluded the study with the recommendations that each teacher preparation institution work with an advisory board of junior high or middle school teachers representing various grade levels and subjects. "Such a group could provide badly needed information and feedback to college or university representatives." (22:554)

Finally, a review of middle school research from 1968-1974 by Wiles and Thomason revealed that most middle school studies have been directed toward assessing the

merits of the middle school in relation to other forms of intermediate education. Of the substantial studies reviewed, none were identified with the area of middle school teacher certification. Under other findings Wiles and Thomason noted that little is being done at present to prepare middle school teachers in colleges and universities and this was attributed largely to the lack of certification requirements specific to these grades. Further, Wiles and Thomason concluded that existing middle school research was, in general, of remarkably low quality being severely limited by the local and regional nature of most studies. (26:421-423)

GROWTH OF THE MIDDLE SCHOOL

After a decade of existence, the middle school has firmly established itself as a legitimate and acceptable model of intermediate education in America. While exact figures are unavailable to the rapid growth of middle schools, somewhat between one-third and one-half of all intermediate schools in the United States now bear this label. (26:421) The middle school concept generally calls for a reorganization of the junior high pattern to a program of grades 5-8 or 6-8. The advantages of this organization include the loss of the ninth grade with its tie to the Carnegie Unit time requirements, a lessening of the academic pressure which has made the junior high school a mini-high school, and a potential for flexibility which can be realized, in both curriculum and scheduling. (22:554)

Gatewood compared the claims and counter-claims regarding the junior high and the middle school and concluded that the junior high school program had failed while the middle school held promise for future success. The junior high schools were cited for their failure to achieve the aims and functions which have been accepted as their reasons for existence. The "debilitating control and influence of the high schools" was also noted as a shortcoming of too many junior high schools. Related to the influence of the high schools is the problem of too early socialization coupled with the strong emphasis on interscholastic athletic activities. (20:264)

Gatewood also recognized the trend toward earlier maturity as a rationale for the emergence of the middle school. "Evidence on child growth and development has been offered indicating that children are physically, socially and psychologically more mature than children in previous years." (20:264)

Research in recent years has provided increasing statistical support for the 6-8 organization.

> A study of Sanders tended to support the theory of Piaget that youth are capable of a more abstract, formal stage of intellectual operations by the age of eleven. He found differences in variance in intelligence, general aptitude, general achievement, and reading test results between a study body composed of grades seven through nine and one composed of grades six through eight. The differences tended to favor slightly a grade combination including grades six, seven and eight, with grade nine's inclusion being somewhat marginal. (20:265)

Studies of sixth and ninth grades by Dacus on the basis of social maturity, physical maturity, and opposite-sex choices "found that ninth graders were more similar to tenth graders in the three criterion measured than they were to eighth graders. Also, sixth grade subjects were slightly more compatible with seventh graders than with fifth graders." (20:266)

The debate over which grades should be included in the middle school has gradually subsided as educators have reached the conclusion that the question of which grades is not nearly as important as which teachers. Vars pointed this out quite clearly when he concluded that as far as the education of young adolescents is concerned the grade organization really does not matter provided the school has good teachers and a sound curriculum. (14:78)

Gatewood reached a similar conclusion concerning middle school grade organization in pointing out "it would appear that educators have been foolishly spending unnecessary time and resources in attempting to resolve this controversy." Rather they should be placing primary emphasis on the development of educational programs consistent with the diverse individual needs of all pre- and early adolescents as well as the preparation of teachers to meet these special needs. (20:273)

NEED FOR SPECIAL MIDDLE SCHOOL CERTIFICATION

Both historical and current research indicate that there will continue to be a "school in the middle" which will bridge the gap between the elementary and the high school, between childhood and adolescence. As the air clears and the issues can be seen in perspective, the questions of which curriculum and which teachers emerge are crucial. Since the creation of a curriculum must be based on the needs of transescents and the needs and conditions of any given community, the question of teachers who are adequately prepared to work with pre- and early adolescents in an ever changing way becomes a focal point. (37:71)

The staffing problems which have plagued the "school in the middle" since its inception will not be alleviated by grade reorganization. On the contrary, since the middle school combines one or more grades that have traditionally been included in the elementary school with grades that have traditionally been included in the secondary realm, the matter of teacher preparation and certification must be reviewed in a different light. Many educators have cited teacher education and certification as the most important issues that the middle school must face. (37:72)

Among early proponents of middle school certification, Howard recognized this problem long before many educators became convinced of the need for specialized preparation and certification. In the summary of his

chapter on staffing he pointed out that the middle school will be no panacea for the staffing problems that have afflicted the junior high school. He further noted that there are few teacher training programs for the prospective junior high school teacher and even fewer specifically designed for teachers in middle school. (8:279)

The lack of opportunity for teachers to acquire specialized training for the middle school positions was also decried by Eichorn.

> As one scans higher education course offerings, one is impressed with the lack of potential training future middle school teachers can acquire. . . . One cannot dispute the need for specialized teachers on the elementary or high school levels, but one finds it difficult to accept that middle school teachers need less specialized training. (34:28)

Closely related to teacher education institutions and the programs which they initiate are state teacher certification requirements. The circular argument that has allowed these two parties to avoid an effective solution has succeeded without apparent irresponsibility on the part of either. Colleges of education declared that, until certification is required, their programs for specialized teacher preparation will be avoided by elementary and secondary education students. State departments of education claim that to require special courses and programs for middle school certification would be illogical when (1) the courses and programs do not even exist, and (2) it is already impossible to find enough middle school teachers when either

secondary or elementary certificates are accepted, without further limiting the field. (22:554)

In order to resolve this apparent dilemma, the Florida State Department of Education contracted with the University of Florida College of Education to develop the necessary competencies for preparation and certification at the middle school level. The University of Florida project was also concerned with the question of inservice teacher training as a means for upgrading middle school teachers' skills and abilities without necessarily returning to a college or university. This inservice aspect dealt primarily with the problem of converting a secondary or an elementary certificate to a middle school certificate when the specified competencies had been met. (37:60)

Stainbrook's follow-up study of a 1959 survey of intermediate grade teachers demonstrated vividly that most programs of training middle school teacher have changed little in recent years. He found that there were, in fact, "no major identifiable differences" between the preparation of middle school teachers today and those ten years ago. His study also noted that middle school teachers and administrators agreed that "special curricula specifically oriented toward the preparation of intermediate school teachers would be of value." (24:284) Stainbrook's recommendations dealt both with the development of preservice requirements for a special middle school certificate as well as teacher certification options which would provide the

elementary and secondary teachers with the specialized training needed for middle school programs. (24:285)

The need for specialized certification was summed up by middle school authority Thomas Curtis in his statement:

> Most states do not recognize a separate certificate for the middle school. In most cases, in fact, teachers are certified for either elementary or secondary education, with all supposedly qualified to teach in the middle. On the contrary, however, middle school teaching is probably the most difficult area for teachers, and to imply that either an elementary or secondary teacher is automatically qualified to teach at this level is short-sighted, to say the least. (17:69)

CURRENT STATUS OF MIDDLE SCHOOL CERTIFICATION

The following status report on "Middle School Certification Requirements" was conducted as an independent study in December of 1977 (35:1-6) and presented to the National Middle School Resource Center in January of 1978:

MIDDLE SCHOOL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

**1.	Alabama	No middle school certification.
2.	Alaska	No middle school certification.
3.	Arizona	No middle school certification.
*4.	Arkansas	Elementary certified teachers may obtain middle school certification (5-9) with 18 hours in subject area. Secondary certified may obtain middle school certification (5-9) with 3 hours in child psychology, 3 hours in middle school methods, and 18 hours in subject area.
5.	California	No middle school certification.

*6.	Colorado	Approved specialization in middle school education to include: 1) major academic preparation; 2) history, philosophy, and principles of the middle school; 3) middle school methods; 4) evaluation and accountability in the middle school.
7.	Connecticut	Elementary and secondary certificates may be extended--secondary to elementary with three years teaching experience including 12 hours of elementary education courses.
8.	Delaware	No middle school certification.
*9.	Florida	Specialized middle school degree program--elementary and secondary extension by one year experience and successful performance in the prescribed middle school components of an approved in-service master plan.
*10.	Georgia	Specialized middle school program of study for grades 4-8.
**11.	Idaho	No middle school certification.
12.	Hawaii	No middle school certification.
13.	Illinois	Elementary certification (k-9) and secondary certification (6-12).
*14.	Indiana	Specialized junior high/middle school program of study for grades 5-9 in a departmentalized situation is included in state colleges. Elementary or secondary extension is approved upon completion of 15 additional hours. Courses include: 1) curriculum for junior high/middle schools; 2) adolescent psychology; 3) methods and 4) directed electives (2 courses); 5) and 18 hours in subject area.
*15.	Iowa	Specialized middle school certificate for grades 4-9. Elementary certification is extended through grade 8.
**16.	Kansas	Secondary extension to grades 5 and 6 in a departmentalized situation requires courses in Child and

		Adolescent Psychology, teaching or student teaching experience in grades 5-9. and 15 hours of subject matter courses.
*17.	Kentucky	Specialized middle school teacher and administrator certification program of study for grades 5-9. Conversion plans provide for extension of existing elementary and secondary certificates.
**18.	Louisiana	No middle school certification.
19.	Maine	No middle school certification.
20.	Maryland	Elementary certification 1-9; Secondary certification is extended in certified subject area in any departmentalized situation.
**21.	Massachusetts	No middle school certification.
*22.	Michigan	Elementary and secondary certificates may be extended to middle school grades 5-9 with 18 hours of approved study.
*23.	Minnesota	Specialized middle school degree program--elementary and secondary extension by 24 quarter hours. Courses include: 1) middle school philosophy and organization; 2) psychology; 3) special learning and behavior problems; 4) teaching experience; 5) reading; 6) subject matter courses.
24.	Mississippi	No middle school certification.
**25.	Missouri	No middle school certification.
26.	Montana	No middle school certification.
*27.	Nebraska	Elementary and secondary extension to middle school grades 4-9 with two years middle grade experience and approved course work through August, 1978. After August, 1978, a specialized middle school degree program will be required for grades 4-9.

28.	Nevada	Elementary certification for grades K-8 self-contained classrooms and in approved middle schools. Secondary certification in grades 7-12 in departmentalized situations and in approved middle schools.
29.	New Hampshire	No middle school certification.
30.	New Jersey	Elementary certification for grades K-8; may teach reading, writing, and arithmetic in grades K-12. Elementary teachers cannot devote more than 1/2 teaching time to elective in elementary grades.
31.	New Mexico	No middle school certification.
32.	New York	No middle school certification.
**33.	North Carolina	Specialized middle certification for grades 4-9.
34.	North Dakota	No middle school certification.
*35.	Ohio	Teachers certified for middle schools upon recommendation of the Superintendent and upon completion of elementary course work.
*36.	Oklahoma	No middle school certification. (electives K-12)
37.	Oregon	Elementary certification (K-9); and secondary certification (5-12).
**38.	Pennsylvania	No middle school certification.
*39.	Rhode Island	Elementary certified teachers may obtain middle school certification (5-8) with additional 12 hours in subject area, adolescent psychology, and middle school methods or curriculum. Secondary certified may obtain middle school certification (5-8) by completing an additional 6 hours in child psychology and elementary or middle school methods.
*40.	South Carolina	Specialized middle school curriculum is included in state colleges. Extension for both elementary and

		secondary requires 9 hours including the teaching of reading.
41.	South Dakota	Elementary certification K-8 and 9 in an approved junior high school. Secondary certification 7-12.
42.	Tennessee	No middle school certification.
*43.	Texas	Junior high certification 6-10 and Earth-Life Science middle school certification based on specialized degree program.
**44.	Utah	No middle school certification.
45.	Vermont	No middle school certification.
46.	Virginia	No middle school certification.
**47.	Washington	No middle school certification.
**48.	West Virginia	No middle school certification.
**49.	Wisconsin	No middle school certification.
**50.	Wyoming	Elementary certification for teachers in grades 1-8 in self-contained classroom and secondary certification for teachers in grades 7-12.
51.	D. C.	Teaching experience approved by the Chief Examiner and 15 additional hours certifies for junior high license. Courses required include: 1) reading; 2) psychology; 3) teaching in urban schools; 4) sociology of urban youth, and 5) materials and methods.

*Middle School Certification

**Proposed Middle School Certification

SUMMARY

Research indicated little change in the pre-service preparation of teachers for the junior and middle school since the inception of the junior high school movement. Although a need for specific training has been expressed for

over sixty years, the teacher training institutions have been less than responsive in the developments of programs to meet this need. Further, the development of specific programs of teacher preparation has been seriously hampered by the lack of general agreement in the content of such a program, and the lack of special certification requirements.

Teacher responses to every major study clearly indicated a real dissatisfaction with the existing teacher preparation programs for the middle school grades. Recommendations for the improvement of these programs include course work in the psychology of the young adolescent, methods and techniques appropriate to the middle grades, and student teaching at the middle school level.

Finally, even the best designed pre-service program must include provision for periodically updating the training to meet the changing needs of the classroom teacher. Such a provision requires that the teacher education institutes work closely with the middle school and middle school teacher to develop and to maintain an effective teacher preparation program. Without a conscious and concerted effort in this direction, junior high and middle school teachers will continue to feel forgotten by the institutions which claim to prepare them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

1. Alexander, W. M., and Associates. The Emergent Middle School. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

2. Bondi, Joseph C. Developing Middle Schools: A Guidebook. New York: MSS Information Corporation, 1972.

3. Fox, David J. The Research Process in Education. Dallas: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

4. Good, C. V. Dictionary of Education. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1973.

5. Gruhn, W. T., and H. R. Douglass. The Modern Junior High School. 3rd ed. New York: The Ronald Press, 1971.

6. Hansen, J. H., and A. C. Hearn. The Middle School Program. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1971.

7. Hertling, James E., and Howard G. Getz. Education for the Middle School Years: Readings. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1971.

8. Howard, A. W., and G. C. Stoubis. The Junior High School and Middle School: Issues and Practices. Scranton: Intext Educational Publishers, 1970.

9. Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

10. Kindred, L. W., and Associates. The Intermediate Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

11. Nickerson, N. C. Junior High Schools Are On the Way Out. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1966.

12. Pooper, S. H. The American Middle School. Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1967.

13. Van Til, William, Gordon Vars, and John Lounsbury. Modern Education for the Junior High School Years. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967.

14. Vars, Gordon F. "Teacher Preparation for the Middle School." Education for the Middle School Years: Readings, eds. J. E. Hertling and H. C. Getz. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1971.

B. PERIODICALS

15. Bossing, Nelson. "Preparing Teachers for Junior High School," High School Journal, 50:151-54, December, 1966.

16. Clarke, Sanford. "The Middle School: Specially Trained Teachers Are Vital to Its Success," Clearing House, 46:218-22, December, 1971.

17. Curtis, Thomas E. "Preparing Teachers for the Middle and Junior High Schools," NASSP Bulletin, 56:60-70, May, 1972.

18. Cuff, William A. "Middle Schools on the March," NASSP Bulletin, 51:82-86, February, 1967.

19. Dixon, Norman R. "The Search for Junior High School Teachers," Clearing House, 40:81-82, October, 1965.

20. Gatewood, Thomas E. "What Research Says About the Junior High Versus the Middle School," North Central Association Quarterly, 46:264-273, Fall, 1971.

21. Hoats, E. R. "Junior High School Teacher Certification," NASSP Bulletin, 48:47-49, October, 1963.

22. Hubert, J. S. "On Preparing Teachers for the Junior High and Middle School," Clearing House, 47:55-64, May, 1973.

23. Lawrence, Gordon. "Measuring Teacher Competencies for the Middle School," National Elementary Principal, 51:60-62, November, 1971.

24. Stainbrook, James R. "Preparing Teachers for the Intermediate Schools," Clearing House, 46:283-286, January, 1972.

25. Toepfer, C. F., Jr. "Who Should Teach in Junior High?" Clearing House, 40:75-79, October, 1965.

26. Wiles, J. W., and Thomason, Julia. "Middle School Research 1968-1974: A Review of Substantial Studies," Educational Leadership, 32:421-423, March, 1975.

C. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

27. Conant, James B. Recommendations for Education in the Junior High School Years. A Memorandum to School Boards, Educational Testing Service, New Jersey, 1960.

28. Malinka, Robert M. "Teaching in the Middle School," Educational Resources Information Center Reports. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1971, Number ED. 083251.

29. Wilson, William E. The Junior High School. A Report Prepared by the Association of Junior and Senior High School Principals, Bulletin No. 246, Indianapolis, Indiana: State of Indiana Department of Public Instruction, 1961.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

30. Ackerman, R. E. "A Critical Analysis of Program for Junior High School Teachers in Teacher Education Institutions of the United States." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1960.

31. Conway, J. S. "A Study to Determine Criteria for State Standards for Junior High Schools of the State of Oregon." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1963.

32. Dalton, E. L. "Preparation Programs for Junior High School Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1962.

33. Dean, L. W. "A Preparation Program for Junior High School Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1956.

34. Eichorn, D. P. "Rationale for Emergence: A Look at the Middle School" (paper presented at the Conference on the Middle School, December 11, 1967, at the School of Education, University of Pittsburgh).

35. Gillan, Robert E. "Middle School Certification--A National Update." Unpublished paper, Northwestern State University, 1978.

36. Glasgow, Russell. "Delphi Technique." Unpublished paper, Northwestern State University, 1977.

37. Hubert, J. B. "A Survey of the Attitudes of Prospective and Experienced Secondary School Teachers Toward the Junior High School." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of New Mexico, 1969.

38. Kidd, Garland B. "A Comparison Study of the Attitudes of Junior High School and Middle School Teachers in Louisiana." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern State University, 1976.

39. Marsh, D. E. "In-service Teacher Education in Oregon Junior High Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1960.

40. Maynard, H. G. "A Study of the Professional Preparation of Junior High School Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, 1960.

41. Sheehad, M. R. "Junior High School Teachers' Evaluation of Preservice Preparation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1969.